

**General Plan 2020
Interest Group Committee Meeting Minutes
September 16, 2003**

Interest Group Committee:

Al Stehly	Farm Bureau
Alexandra Elias	American Planning Association
Bruce Tabb	Environmental Development
Carolyn Chase	SD Coalition for Transportation Choices
Dan Silver	Endangered Habitats League
Dave Shibley	Save Our Land Values
David Younkman	National Wildlife Federation
Diane Coombs	Citizen Coordinate for Century 3
Eric Bowlby	Sierra Club
Erik Bruvold	SD Regional Economic Development Corporation
Greg Lambron	Helix Land Company
Jim Whalen	Alliance for Habitat Conservation
Karen Messer	Buena Vista Audubon Society
Liz Higgins	SD Association of Realtors
Matt Adams	Building Industry Association
Mike Thometz	Back Country Coalition
Phil Pryde	SD Audubon Society
Terry Barker	American Society of Landscape Architects

Public at Large:

Almeda Starkey	
Brent McDonald	Caltrans
Carol Leone	
Charlene Ayers	
Ernest Barrera	Ramona Sentinel
Eric Larson	
Janelle Riella	Senator Hollingworth
Jeanne Pagett	
Jerry Winter	Fallbrook
Lael Montgomery	Valley Center
Parke Troutman	UCSD
Rich Rudolf	Valley Center
Todd Galarneau	McMillin Companies
Troy Murphree	SWA

County Staff:

Karen Scarborough (DPLU, group facilitator)
Gary Pryor (DPLU)
Ivan Holler (DPLU)
LeAnn Carmichael (DPLU)
Michelle Yip (DPLU)
Tom Harron (County Counsel)
Sachiko Kohatsu (District 3)

Agenda Item I: Logistics –

a) Minutes for May 13, 2003

- Thometz mentioned a typing error on pg. 4, 2nd bullet.
- Pryde moved to approve. Bowlby seconded the motion. Motion passed.

b) Minutes for May 27, 2003

- Bowlby noted the different style of minutes; stated that this set does not reflect thoughts.
- Adams moved to approve. Shibley seconded the motion. Motion passed 11-0-4.

Agenda Item II: Residential Property Referrals (Presentation Only) –

- Holler mentioned that on June 25th, the Board had recommended that staff evaluate certain properties, including those that came out of the Planning Commission. These referrals were primarily residential but some were commercial and industrial and staff's recommendation is to defer action on those. Staff evaluated about 180 referrals, which were compiled into a matrix and sent to community planning and sponsor groups. Comments were due August 1st and evaluated for the August 22nd Planning Commission hearing. Subsequent to the Planning Commission hearings, staff re-evaluated the referrals; staff agreed with approximately 40 referrals, proposed a compromise solution on 64 (some cases, the property owner agreed to the compromise), and disagreed with about 80. Staff will appear before the Board on September 24th to respond to these residential property referrals. If needed, the hearing will proceed to the following Wednesday, October 1st.
- An area of the process that still remains is the evaluation of commercial and industrial land and transportation runs have to be completed. Staff has been working with SANDAG for some time and we expect additional changes to be recommended.
- Scarborough asked if the Interest Group will be reviewing the results of the transportation run. Holler replied yes, at some level.
- Pryde wanted to know the results of staff's actions (proposed compromises) – how many buildable lots were created, how that number divided up, and what was west of the CWA. Holler responded that staff looked at densities, not lots; in most cases, staff agreed or proposed a compromise solution in areas that had better access to infrastructure and services, which was one of the principles written in the addendum.
- Whalen asked for more details on upcoming steps. Holler replied that the next steps include the commercial/industrial analysis and transportation modeling; staff would like to begin the commercial/industrial analysis after the Board hearing and run transportation as soon as the remaining issues are solved with SANDAG. Then we will need to get into the EIR and evaluate different alternatives in the EIR.
- Whalen questioned the accuracy of the transportation model results. Pryor stated that in a general plan, average trip generations can be expected for every acre of commercial; this approach will be accurate enough to project the road as to the number of lanes and the configuration, whether it is a divided or undivided, 2-lane or 6-lane.
- Messer asked if staff will be going to the Board before the EIR begins. Pryor replied yes; once we complete the traffic modeling, staff will probably begin to look at groundwater issues and those are the two biggest constraints outside of the habitat issue. Staff will come back to this body and the planning groups to figure out the imbalance that we are anticipating to occur in some areas and that will be the preferred alternative in the EIR; then we will discuss with the Board other alternatives to look at.
- Bruvold asked how long the process of going out to the communities for adjustments is going to take. Pryor responded at least 60 days since it is a planning group function.
- Higgins asked who will address the commercial/industrial analysis and at what point will it come to this committee. Pryor replied that staff will run the total acreage and breakdown the total for each community based on the land use distribution. We will know the inventory for each community and therefore, whether there is a surplus or deficit. Once the information is generated, it will go to the communities and to this group.

- Bowlby stated that he is interested in seeing what the increased population on this current proposal might do to the circulation system since the traffic study for Alternative 3 showed a good deal of failing levels of circulation and standards.
- Chase asked if groundwater could come before transportation. Pryor replied that staff will probably run the two concurrently. Carmichael added that groundwater is one of our constraints and all we are doing is updating it with new rainfall maps. It is already embedded in the population model; we are waiting for the update and then we will re-run that.
- Adams asked if rooftops were going to get pushed out, which will create competition, in communities perceived as deficits. Pryor replied that that could take shape in a couple of ways – density could be increased in areas where housing is already being looked at, adjacency issues may need to be looked at (if land is immediately adjacent to an existing use), or reduce the housing if they do not want the employment but then they are faced back with the future population we are planning for; we cannot let that slide to have an inadequate housing supply. Carmichael added that this also gets complicated because it is a regional issue; typically, people commute to regional centers as a lot of our communities are bedroom communities so we are still probably going to end up with a deficit. There are still some issues we are going to have to sort through.
- Messer asked what percentage of trips are modeled to be within and outside the community. Pryor replied that you run your trip distribution on origins and destinations; the models are set up to do that, to take proximity into account.
- Thometz asked when we are going to have population as a result for particular areas. Pryor replied that population was the first broad cut of what we were looking at for total growth and we have moved beyond that. The model is set up to run densities and that will tell you an estimate of what we can reasonably expect for population within a geographic area; that is what is really going to be the controlling factor, not the numbers.

Agenda Item III: Open Space Subdivision –

a) Discussion

- This chart is a revised version and essentially, represents revisions that have taken place over the past several months. A project would need to meet the minimum open space percentages in order to qualify for this sort of subdivision. If development occurred on the least environmentally sensitive portions of the site and it meets the total open space percentage, then yield reduction would not apply but if the development does not meet the requirements, then the yield reduction in RPO would apply. There are a few other things in the footnotes, specifically, a need to be sensitive to design standards and a concept of a remainder parcel.
- Messer stated that this is a means to take advantage of density based planning and thinks it is a good compromise. If adopted, there is a big potential for much improved development because what impacts the land use is the footprint of development.
- Whalen thinks the footnotes are more important than the size of type they are in. Also concerned about the yield reduction issue because it was the basis for their [development interests] support.
- Shibley stated that he agrees with the chart conceptually but when applied to the ground, it does not make sense; it is too restrictive when it comes to designing it. Proposed to go with a percentage – if 90% is to be open space, then 10% should be the maximum lot size or maximum footprint, which is 16 acres rather than five (1 du/160 ac). Suggested deleting maximums because the percentages do not match up with the open space percentages.
- Pryde asked about the difference between the open space calculation and the area outside the footprint. Silver replied that the gap was initially proposed by staff for infrastructure. Realizing that you may not use all of that for infrastructure, they thought a remainder parcel could serve as an incentive for the building industry; if they cluster more effectively, they can increase their remainder parcel but it would have no density at this time and would require a general plan amendment to receive more density. This has approach has more flexibility than doing a direct correlation.
- Elias questioned the function of this product; is this a mechanism for clustering that would not happen any other way and if you decouple from the zoning perspective, you would not need a subdivision on top of that. Holler responded that our current plan has lot size restrictions that would

preclude doing this in some communities. Eventually this will go to the Board and if ultimately adopted, would end up in the Zoning Ordinance and maybe the Subdivision Ordinance as well. Pryor added that this was a compromise between parties where one side is looking to make sure the yield stays stable so we can meet the housing and the other side is looking to try to get away from the fragmentation of the open space—backyards and isolated pockets—that are not sustainable environmental units. Many communities do not have the minimum open space; they have a minimum lot size. That minimum lot size may let them leave some remainder area for the open space but it also allows someone to go up in the size of the lot to have zero open space; that is prevented by this mechanism.

- Coombs asked what the open space percentage is under the current clustering regulations. Carmichael replied that it is 40% if it is a planned residential development, which we do not do many of. Coombs stated that the 25% open space percentage in the 1 du/ac category is less than what we are getting currently. Pryor added that 40% is not a real number since the open space ends up being easements in people's backyards instead of clustered lots. Coombs stated that one of the major problems we are facing is that people are destroying the habitat and open space features of large lots. The County does not do a very good job of enforcing open space and conservation easements now and asked if there will be some kind of commitment to make sure that people in the clustered area do not store boats, RVs and junk in the open space.
- Shibley reiterated that he feels the chart is too restrictive in the way it is set up.
- Bruvold asked why a minimum lot size is needed. If you do away with minimum lot sizes, you solve the issue of sprawl with percentages of open space and maximum footprints. Scarborough responded that the issue is the concept of community character.
- Higgins expressed concern over the maximum footprint; feels it is too restrictive and therefore, the maximum footprints should be re-evaluated under the mandatory Rural Lands in order to make this more acceptable to the people actually buying property. Stated that the mandatory aspect should be eliminated and be voluntary instead.
- Silver emphasized that there has been a paradigm shift. Stated that they [environmental interests] would rather have had the whole chart mandatory and that the voluntary aspect is a compromise. This is real planning that actually protects resources; the mandatory aspect on the Rural Lands is really fundamental. In response to Shibley's comment on flexibility, by doing this subdivision voluntarily, you are not subject to yield reduction and are exempt from slope encroachment limits so if the least environmentally sensitive area is in the slope, you can go into the slope. The mandatory in Rural Lands and 1 du/10 ac was the bottom line for the environmental interests.
- **Motion:** Silver moved to approve the Open Space Subdivision. Adams seconded the motion.
- Bowlby asked if golf courses could be included under passive recreation. General response was no.
- Bowlby mentioned that the open space percentages in the chart were less than what is required under MSCP scenarios. Silver replied that in discussions, they have tried to say this is not biology but rather to be done purely on a land use planning basis; the notion is that this is independent of habitat planning.
- Bowlby asked if brush management would still be inside the project footprint in the Rural Lands area. Scarborough replied that brush management is included unless it is infeasible. Carmichael added that in the 1 du/10 ac and 1 du/20 ac categories, it can go outside if you cannot accommodate it within the 2 acre maximum footprint. Bowlby was concerned that the difference in area between the maximum footprint and the open space percentage requirement would become a territory for brush management. Scarborough replied that this was something that the group has dealt with in great detail, trying to decide if it is better to increase the footprint for brush management inside or just what was the best configuration. Brush management has to go inside the 5-acre maximum footprints but if it cannot be configured in the 2-acre footprints, there is a flex area, outside the open space, to accommodate it.
- Shibley re-stated that he does not like the mandatory in Rural Lands and wanted to ensure some protection that the voluntary does not become mandatory.
- Scarborough responded to several points made around the table:
 1. Reason there is such strong support with notable exceptions is because this has something substantial to offer to both sides – efficiency

2. Reason minimum lot size is there is because of the issue of community input – it would be understood that this is a standard way of doing business
 3. It would seem that if you offered someone a 5-acre lot with a beautiful open space preserve backing it up, would be quite an amenity
 4. Thinks there are many projects that would be viable under this in rural areas that would not be built otherwise – it allows the lot size to come down and allows efficiencies of clustering, so it is not a constraint but instead allows opportunities
- Thometz was concerned with the 2-acre maximum being too small and feels the 5-acre maximum is more than adequate. Feels that large ranches will not make it 20 years from now and that we need to plan for open space.
 - Bowlby asked what prevents someone from doing a GPA and adding houses on the remainder parcel. Holler replied that someone could ask for that but there are limits to amendments per year. Adams added that if it is not economically viable, no one would do it.

b) Action

- **Vote:** To adopt this draft of the Open Space Subdivision and recommend it for the adoption process subject to future refinements regarding the areas of enforcement of open space and the agricultural provisions. Modifications include: bullet #6 – acknowledging that this bullet (agriculture) needs to be modified, #3 – should read *open space subdivisions* instead of *conservation subdivisions*, and #5 – include *and slope encroachment limits* after *yield reductions*. 13-3-1 (Pryde, Higgins, and Shibley in opposition; Bowlby abstained).

Agenda Item IV: Next Steps –

- Scarborough mentioned that the next Interest Group meeting will address equity mechanisms; Commercial and Industrial has not been set.

Agenda Item V: Public Comments –

- Silver (on behalf of the Endangered Habitats League): Believes that these referrals got out of control and are not within the scope of what we anticipated which were refinements of the Working Copy. We agreed to support the Working Copy as a compromise; to us these go far beyond refinements. The acres affected (8,000) go to more density on inefficient areas and so when staff says we are trying to not put inefficient land uses, you just made 8,000 acres more inefficient; the rural areas were really hard hit. We do not believe this is consistent with what this group thought. We cannot support the compromises in the December Working Copy. We are not willing to live with this stuff in the August Working Copy. The December Working Copy is the basis for our agreement. This has gotten out of control; it has gotten political. We would like you to support the December Working Copy with error corrections and refinements.
- Whalen: The position of our interests is that refinements have a different meaning; never changed position of more than a package deal.
- Coombs announced that the “Planning for the Future” video is out, which was previewed on UCSD TV and the County TV networks. Focuses on applying smart growth principles to four communities. C-3 is having their annual awards presentation.